

Integral Vision for Restorative Justice in Education

Integral Vision for Restorative Justice in Education

JOAN M. NESBITT
Kwantlen University College

VERONIKA BOHAC CLARKE
University of Calgary

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to examine traditional organizational structures and leadership styles in Canada, to assess their responsiveness to a changing educational, social and political context, and to propose an alternative approach. We argue that the educational enterprise would benefit from distancing itself from these traditional models, and moving towards embracing a transformational style of leadership based on a restorative justice model. This paradigm would include a holistic, inclusive, integral approach from which educational leaders and their constituents could bring about change both within learning communities and the larger social order by challenging existing patriarchal constructs and practices.

Introduction

“The problems that we have created cannot be solved at the level of thinking that created them.”

Albert Einstein

Traditional educational models closely parallel those of corporate organizational systems. This should not be all that surprising, given that educational systems, albeit in the business of enlightening minds, do so with a clear eye towards their fiscal bottom line. Thus, policy decisions have been, and often still are, handed down in a hierarchical fashion, with little consideration given to how leadership styles impact the organization as a whole or the learning communities they are to serve. After two decades of attempts at educational reforms, as existing power structures are challenged by increasingly more informed stakeholders, great dramas and posturing often unfold as both leaders and constituents circle one another in an attempt to assert their positions and have them validated through an energy sapping ecology of games (Firestone, 1989). What is often forgotten in this leadership-constituent dance is that both parties are trying to bring about change while working within a system that is designed or resigned to meet corporate needs rather than human needs. Unfortunately, this results in a system that further alienates educational leaders and their constituents as they fight and compete within a system whose primary purpose does not appear to be meeting the needs of learning communities, but rather meeting the market demand for skilled workforce as efficiently as possible.

To this end, and in light of the above, in this paper we propose the use of a transformational model of leadership, situated within a restorative educational framework based on a justice model, for the purpose of bringing about substantive change in public sector educational leadership and decision making. Before discussing what this model might look like in praxis, it is imperative to examine in closer detail why traditional corporate models have limited application in Canadian classrooms today.

Modernist Heritage in a Post-Modern World: Struggle for Individual Morality Amid Corporate Values in Traditional Organizational Paradigms

During the past several decades educational leadership had embraced a Weberian view of the world. This includes an approach that reflects a formidable Capitalist bureaucracy, replete with hierarchical structures, run by leaders who espouse values upon which the status quo is built (Hodgkinson, 1991). A paradigm built by men for men on the foundations of scientific and behavioral management practices, with success or failure being measured in quantifiable terms; an organizational model whereby one is asked to lose oneself for the sake of the larger collective body, in this case, the educational organization. In its extreme form, this approach has been manifested in terms of the “banality of evil.”

The rapid advances in technology have brought about a philosophical shift in the larger social order that reflects the pernicious times in which we live, and from which no aspect of society is exempt. Stephen Covey (2004) describes these changes as “global seismic shifts.” He offers the magic number of seven seismic shifts: the globalization of markets and technologies; the emergence of universal connectivity; the democratization of information/expectations; an exponential increase in competition; the movement of wealth creation from financial capital to intellectual and social capital; free agency; and permanent white water (Covey, 2004, pp 103-105).

Permanent white water is an apt description of the context outside of organizations as well. The advances in technology far outstrip the human ability to adjust intellectually, morally and spiritually to the speed of progress and to the magnitude of change it brings. The end result is a world thrown into a state of individual and organizational chaos, grasping to make sense out of the new world order. No longer can organizations and leaders remain simply complacent to accept their prescribed roles; on the contrary, previously accepted models and practices are now under the scrutiny of leaders, constituents and the collective social body as they examine the power of organizations to define themselves and their impact on the larger society.

The global market has reacted with a merciless drive for survival, with the radical restructuring of large corporations resulting in massive layoffs and a relentless pursuit of the bottom line. Nowhere is this clearer than in television advertisements, where corporations portray themselves as new age partners of the consumer. Market driven adaptations and populist slogans, however, do not hide the fact that corporations behind the ads serve same purpose as their predecessors – just in a more efficient format. An interesting example is provided on the back cover of Covey’s book in the form of endorsement from Kevin Rollins, President and CEO of Dell Inc.:

Getting results in large companies is a very rare skill and this book captures how to do it. The guidance provided here will prove valuable for leaders who are trying to drive tighter execution in their organizations. (Covey, 2004).

For individuals working within this monolithic model, the pressure for corporate success may result in an existential struggle between making choices that will ultimately allow leaders to define themselves and their leadership styles through the choices they make, or being forced to make choices that will reduce them to leadership automatons (Bauman, 1993), mere cogs in the wheel of an organizational Frankenstein. Ironically, in the middle of this struggle, there is little doubt as to the organization's ability to make decisions that are in its best interests (Hodgkinson, 1991). From this perspective, the organization is able to embrace its existential calling at the expense of both the leaders who run it and the larger society it serves. Not surprisingly, as further argued by Hodgkinson (1991), this results in a system that is morally bankrupt, unresponsive to the needs of its leaders and constituents, and somehow sees itself as separate and apart from the larger society. That is, the organization as a cosmic force that manages to take on a God-like presence.

The moral basis of organizations, or lack thereof, has been the subject of debate for years. It is no secret that organizations have traditionally created cult-like followers from both within their own ranks, and the larger society, resulting in leaders and consumers who rarely question the moral and ethical basis of decisions. But taken to its extreme, the climate of conspicuous production and consumption becomes both a driving force and a cause unto itself (Bauman, 1993; Mason, 2001), with leaders and consumers erroneously led to believe that they are working towards a greater social cause. This is painfully apparent in the marketing of exorbitantly priced products, for example, jeans with labels such as, "Citizens of Humanity", which were recently spotted on a store rack in Vancouver. The irony clearly seems to escape the eager consumers. In light of the above, Hodgkinson (1991) suggests that leadership takes on a reductionist role resulting in a form of moral curiosity in relation to constituents.

Unfortunately, bereft of any self-reflection on the part of the leader, or critical review of the organization's moral and ethical motives, leaders end up in a state of moral malaise, with little thought given to whose interests are being served by the manner in which decisions are carried out. With respect to this latter point, Bauman (1993), argues that there can be no morality without self-reflection, and thus, leaders who are not prepared to engage in this practice are not moral beings per se, but reduced to the role of organizational yes men. Thus, if, as suggested by both Bauman and Havel (Bauman, 1993; as cited in Capp, 1968), morality does not make the man, but rather, man creates morality, then leaders may find themselves caught in a moral, cognitive dissonance snare with respect to where the foundations for moral decisions should originate from. If we embrace moral relativism as discussed by Mason (2001), then this leads us in the direction of an external, universal moral code, as set out in various pieces of legislation.

However, if we lean in the direction of a marriage between Havel's (1992) writings on governance and Bauman's (1993) notion of moral intuition, where morality originates from the essence of the individuals themselves, (an intangible concept that separates man from State), then the suggestion of an external moral code becomes redundant, almost laughable. Thus, those individuals who are not morally reflective may be able to reconcile the dissonance between self-

interests and organizational interests by simply following organizational policies and procedures. On the other hand, individuals who strive to define their essence through the choices they make as moral beings, may find themselves in the middle of a leadership crisis; a form of post-modern existential meltdown that may force them to question their position in relation to both the organizational structure and the collective societal body and explore new organizational models that will meet their needs.

Thus, despite the constraints that leaders face in any given situation, they always have choices even if in the final analysis this requires them to walk away from the organization itself. By exercising the leadership equivalent of organizational existentialism, leaders are in a position to re-define both themselves and the larger society through the choices they make (Bauman, 1993; Johnson, 1997). Thus, it is by taking the path of greatest resistance (Johnston, 1997) that leaders define themselves by rising above the bureaucupathology (Hodgkinson, 1991) of the organization and moving towards more holistic leadership models and practices.

Leading for Change in a Post-Modern World: Transformative Models of Leadership

The recognition of the power of globalization, interdependence, organic versus mechanic thinking, and harnessing individual creative power, as described in Covey's book, does not automatically lead to enlightened leadership, but might in fact lead to the use and abuse of this knowledge for the purpose of tighter execution of results. This leaves organizational leaders in a precarious situation, if they actually believe in using the new organizational knowledge to improve corporate citizenship and look for opportunities to do so. In contrast to traditional models of leadership, Burns (1978) suggests that some leaders are able to take on transformational roles by engaging in the human process of leadership with their constituents. In this role, leaders step outside the confines of traditional organizational reality constraints (Hodgkinson, 1991), and move towards creating an environment that challenges leadership decisions based on tightly defined organizational goals, while working towards developing a more humanistic model that reflects a moral and ethical foundation, elevating both leader and constituent, to higher moral ground for the greater good of society.

Wilber (2003) supports this types of transformational model that charts individuals pursuing higher ordered thinking, with both leaders and constituents moving towards an model which sidesteps para-military hierarchical drills of the "orange meme" level of development, in favor of a "green meme" model steeped humanity, social justice, equality, and inclusivity. For Wilber (2003), this view of the world stems from the recognition of human developmental stages or waves, from the "beige meme" survival to "yellow meme" universal interconnectedness. Wilber further believes that every individual and society has to go through all the developmental stages, and transcend and include each previous stage. The current dramatic changes in organizational and individual lives illustrate the transcendence of the orange meme to the green meme.

As argued by Shklar (1986, p.16), "[T]he State of nature remains a plausible alternative to every known historical society, and so it serves as an enduring mirror of possibilities." Thus, by deconstructing previously held beliefs, including the need to for power and property to be sacrosanct to nature and the value of human relationships, leaders can emancipate themselves from traditional leadership models for the purpose of reconstructing their view of the world and

their relationship to it. With the end result being a human system, one whereby the bottom line is measured in terms of the value of human beings. This is in stark contrast to a traditional organizational model that espouses to work with machine-like precision in its pursuit of the fiscal bottom line, with little regard to how it impacts society as a whole.

Restorative Education

Given the growing disillusionment with the ability of traditional organizational models to bring about change, and given the possibilities opened up by transformational leadership models, the idea of restorative education appears as a significant contender to fill the vacuum left behind by the discarded models. Restorative education is a model which draws its strength from restorative justice; a holistic and integral approach (Wilber, 2000) that is premised on finding solutions within communities (Cawsey, 1991), for the betterment of all parties involved, including the larger society. It is significant to note that the traditional organizational model closely reflects an Anglo-Saxon retributive justice model, with the emphasis on State run bureaucracies, complete with a division of State and church, and a focus on punishing individuals for wrongs done against the State. In contrast to this, transformational organizational models share many of the same characteristics of restorative justice models, with a holistic focus. That is, a model that recognizes the uniqueness of individuals, and the power of collective bodies, specifically communities for the purpose of working together to bring about change that will result in a betterment of both individuals and the larger community.

From Assumptions to Implementation

In the restorative educational model proposed here, State driven policies and practices become subordinate to the power of the individual to bring about change, with the end goal being learning communities that reflect social justice policies and practices; an egalitarian vision of the world where teachers become learners and learners become teachers as they move towards understanding world views other than their own. As stated by Elliot (2004, p. 292), “[T]he connections between criminal justice, public schools, the family and social welfare are often obfuscated by discrete departmental mandates that inhibit holistic collaboration....” Thus, if learning communities are to be sensitive to the needs of all parties, including students, educators, administrators, and members of society, a holistic approach requires both macro and micro lenses to view the new world order. This is supported by the belief that by empowering individuals it is possible to bring about change that extends beyond the parameters of the learning community. This approach both recognizes and values individuals in relation to the larger social spiral, with the end goal being a world imbued with a sense of peacemaking and social justice (Bohm, 1997; Elliot, 2004). Clearly, this is a huge undertaking from an organizational point of view, but as was emphasized throughout the literature (Anderson & Adams, 1992; Harper, 1997; Johnson, 1997), social institutions cannot be understood in isolation from the larger society if we are to move towards an era of verisimilitude, while leaving behind a legacy of patriarchal partial truths (Maher & Tetrault, 1992). To this end, if leaders are prepared to take up Havel’s challenge to live in truth (as cited in Capp, 1968), this approach asks as much from its leaders as it does from its constituents, with the requisite order of the day being a commitment from both parties to work towards bringing about change within learning communities, all the while working towards global change.

This on its own is a tall order, however, the problem becomes further compounded, when we specifically look at educational systems and take into consideration that even defining its primary task is fraught with difficulty (Hodgkinson, 1991). Thus, if leaders desire to become educational front runners in terms of developing new leadership models, they have to be prepared to work towards clearly defining their own vision of the world before they can lay claim to knowing what is in the educational enterprise's best interests. This is especially important when looking at restorative education in light of the resistance Indigenous peoples have faced in their quest to move towards self-government, including a separate legal system.

The Restorative Model in Education

Ironically, the restorative educational model proposed has its roots in a model that has its own sordid legacy of upheaval, resistance and uprising against Eurocentric models of justice. This is further complicated by the fact that Indigenous populations have been the recipients of cultural genocide at the hands of the mainstream society. Clearly, as restorative educational leaders, there is much to be learned by closely examining the fundamental pillars of truth that traditional restorative justice models are based on and why Indigenous populations have stood behind this model despite the adversity the model has generated. This exploratory journey begins with the examination of the broader parameters of the model.

There still appears to be reticence on the part of disempowered groups to work collaboratively with the larger society, partly owing a long legacy of British colonialism and assimilation. Another reason for the cautious attitude might be the combination of our present day multi-cultural practices and immigration policies which appear to speak more about social control, under the guise of being legitimate State practices, than they do about creating a balanced cultural mosaic. Harper (1997) further echoes these sentiments when she examines some of the historical ghosts that continue to haunt present day social systems, including educational policies that have their roots in educational eugenics. Elliot (2004) goes on to argue that it is through restorative measures that we can re-instate a sense of community awareness with respect to larger generic social problems that society faces. But is awareness of the big picture enough? Do leaders not have a social responsibility to work towards righting the wrongs of the past through present day educational policies and practices? With this in mind, social justice is a cause that educators have to be prepared to take on in order to bring about the transformation of a civilized, just and fair society. To this end, as argued by Clear and Dammer (2003, pp. 305-306), "[S]ocial justice, then, is embodied in the guarantee of this democratic promise. Without social justice, there can be no hope for democratic, nor pride in democratic institutions."

Restorative Model in Action

The potential of restorative education rests in its ability to relate the social injustices of the past, with the inequities of the present, and present them in a manner so that leaders can identify and contextualize the big picture of the larger social problems and work backwards towards resolving these issues within a current educational context. Thus, the restorative educational model is not simply aimed at restoring harmony in the halls of academe, but also in the larger society, with the hope that once connections are made with respect to the root of the problem, that the learning community and the larger community can form a partnership (Clear & Dammer, 2003) to work

toward ameliorating the systemic causes of the problem. This means working toward practical and real solutions, rather than dwelling on centuries old evils and holding individuals responsible for a legacy of systemic abuses that have resulted in a culture of ism's: racism, sexism, and classism.

Inspired by dissatisfaction with the present educational model, restorative thinkers quite simply start by asking how to make the world a better place through inclusive practices that place people at the heart of the decision-making. This is not a novel concept on its own; what makes it novel is the desire to shift a restorative justice model to the educational setting, and re-work it to meet the needs of the learning community, while respecting the uniqueness and integrity of both models. In the educational setting, a desire to make learning communities reflect "collective efficacy" (Clear & Dammer, 2003, p. 309) is a justice concept that fits nicely with the overall goals of most educational philosophies. There can be no question that it is an ambitious plan designed to improve the quality of life both within the educational setting and the community at large; a transformational model aimed at challenging how leaders have traditionally responded to the vagaries of time, place, context, leaders and constituents, all the while recognizing that the real challenge lies in "...how to create innovative programs that have the aspects needed by bureaucratic organizations without the liability of bureaucracy" (Clear & Dammer, 2003, p. 308). Overcoming the often suffocating confines of formal organizational structures to bring about the humanitarian delivery of services that results in all individuals being treated with respect, dignity, and caring, is a daunting task for educational leaders.

Required characteristics of leaders. Leaders have to carefully assess their compatibility with a post modern model that eschews conservative, top-down patriarchal leadership practices, as they move towards creating an environment that brings leaders and constituents face-to-face to identify problems, set goals and work towards the resolution of those goals, within a "peace is practice" philosophy (Elliot, 2004). Here the bigger picture may force leaders to examine their own philosophical frames of reference in relation to the larger Cosmos (Havel, n.d), as they move towards transforming the context from which decisions will be made; a playing field where everyone is equal as a human being, and everyone is recognized as unique (Anderson & Adams, 1992).

Christopher Hodgkinson stresses the importance of knowing oneself before exercising any authority that has impact on others. This means analyzing and declaring one's own values and recognizing how they interact with the social structures within which one operates:

The point of the exploration has already been made, but, to reiterate, it is the peculiar onus upon those who would aspire to leadership in the truest sense to achieve the maximum degree of self-knowledge and self-mastery. This may sound idealistic, but it is my conviction that it is neither ethereal nor impractical, but rather an ultra-practical or even hyper-practical suggestion. That it is avoided as often as not is merely the mark of malaise, of the flight into reason rather than beyond it. Will supervenes reason. (Hodgkinson, 1999, p. 149)

Integral thinking. Ken Wilber's (2000) integral model is deceptively simple, in that its surface level is easily understood. This is why it can be used effectively as an organizing framework. As

one works with the model and gains deeper understanding of it, one can begin to recognize increasing levels of complexity within the model. This quality is also illustrated by the ability of the model to be applied to holons of various magnitudes, from the individual to the organization, to the state, etc. Wilber was able to show that human development can be placed in 4 sectors, which he represents as 4 quadrants of a square:

-I – Upper Left: Interior of the individual, “intentional” – the subjective aspect of consciousness, individual awareness, values, morals, spirituality, self concept, and so forth.

-IT – Upper Right: Exterior of the individual, “behavioral” – objective or exterior correlates of the interior states of consciousness; objective accounts of the scientific facts about the individual organism.

-WE – Lower Left: Inside of the collective, “cultural” – values, meanings, worldviews, and ethics that are shared by any group of individuals, from family, to school, to church, and so forth.

-ITS – Lower Right: Exterior of the collective, “social” – social systems such as material institutions, geopolitical formations, forces of production, and so forth.



A specific example: Wilber's model applied to school contexts in Canada. From Bohac Clarke (2002).

A model of restorative education is aimed at shaking up the upper right and lower right quadrants, thus rattling the cages of scientific objectivity, universal truths, and organizational truths, and other oxymorons. Using Wilber's model as an organizing framework, we see a marked philosophical shift between the world as one premised on State-driven justice practices, to one of collective-driven educational practices. This movement between the lower two quadrants forces us to re-examine the role of truth from a social justice perspective. Not

surprisingly, truth moves from that of an objective frame of reference, one in which we are all led to believe we are bound by universal truths, unquestioned and unquestionable, defined by reigning social institutions, to that of subjectively situated and understood truths that reflect the complexity of different groups in society and their struggle to be recognized and validated by the larger society. As mentioned previously, if leaders' goals are to live in truth and find truth, then to reach this pinnacle of authenticity leaders must first be prepared to examine their own truths, and other's truths in relation to larger societal truths. This "living in truth" asks leaders to challenge all the institutional ties that bind them, leaving leaders with the opportunity to re-write both their role as educational leaders and their relationship to constituents and the larger society. No longer under the theoretical auspices of conservative, State driven initiatives, leaders are free to examine new paradigms such as restorative education from which to make sense out of the world around them. This emancipation of roles and rules, ideally, should set leaders free on a course to carefully examine their relationship to both institutional practices and larger societal social constructs.

Power in a Restorative Model

It is the notion of power, or the imbalance, more accurately, that drives leaders into the arms of a restorative education model. Power, in its simplest form, corrupts. Thus, by striving to re-define the power structures within the educational setting, and ultimately society, leaders are attempting to breath life into an antiquated institution, based on an old boys network, that does not reflect the multi-cultural world in which we live. In fact, what quickly becomes apparent is that the old boys network is now the minority group, (though no one wants to have their name attached to pointing this out), and that the marginalized groups, usually divided along cultural, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, and class lines, have actually become the majority and are rising up to claim their piece of social power. In order to succeed, however, these disenfranchised groups have to break down the institutional barriers which have kept them in a subordinate position, by asking them to re-define themselves from within a patriarchal, capitalist system (Johnston, 1997). This frame of reference that rests at the root of the problem and only further alienates the disenfranchised groups from both the educational setting and society as a whole. Such institutional barriers create constituents who, while manifesting symptoms of academic anomie, are further victimized by the pedagogies imposed upon them. As pointed out by Anderson and Adam (1992) and Maher and Tetrault (1992), leaders are doing both students and the larger society a huge disservice when they don't create learning communities that allow students to feel empowered as a result of the unique perspectives they bring to the classroom, and concomitantly, the permission to confidently take these frames of reference back with them to share with the larger society. Thus, educational leaders, whether working from within the classroom setting or from an administrative post need to create new structures, both through the use of classroom pedagogies and the larger educational infrastructure (Anderson & Adams, 1992; Maher & Tetrault, 1992), that recognize and give previously voiceless students a chance to stand up and be heard. To do otherwise is to be complicit in a form of bloodless cultural genocide that attempts to ignore the richness of their grand narratives.

Changing Societal Views About Values, Rights, and Responsibilities

This shifting from individual accountability to collective responsibility may be symptomatic of a larger shift in the changing values of society. As argued by Lupart (1998), changes to human rights legislation was a wake up call to educators to examine and clean up their own in-house practices. To this end, restorative education provides us with a paradigm that neither fits neatly into a value consensus model or a conflict model for that matter, but rather, appears to be that of a values model. If we embrace Boss's (1998) argument, universal values exist for each of us to assist in our understanding of the world. Thus, restorative education purports a model that embraces human values: respect, dignity, sharing, and inclusiveness, with an understanding that individuals will be held accountable for their decisions; a model of humble and precarious beginnings that all global citizens could learn from.

Clear and Dammer (2003) argue that the greatest obstacle restorative reforms face, is their anti-bureaucratic sentiment. This is not only significant from an organizational point of view, but it also forces leaders to examine their own value systems in light of the larger society's values. To this end, Hodgkinson (1991), argues that if the educational system is to succeed in being the conduit for bringing about change, it must be open to shedding its old image and taking on the role of an extended family, complete with a tribal (Lower Left Quadrant) mentality that fosters tolerance, caring, nurturing and diversity. It could be argued here that this paradigm shift once again moves leaders in the direction of a matriarchal model, one that clearly would be an affront to the patriarchal models of the past under which both men and women continue to suffer (Johnston, 1997). Clearly, a model that would reject the use of scientific formulas to make sense out of human relations and distributive justice (Taylor, 1995), moves leaders one step closer to creating a learning community of leaders who, as patently naïve as this may sound, are not afraid to get to know their constituents as people first. Thus, successes and failures would be measured in terms of the collective body's ability to accommodate diverse groups, while providing a rich environment from which each constituent is treated in an egalitarian manner for the purpose of reaching their own potential as a human being, a potential that may be better served by one model over another.

Current Restorative Models and Their Assumptions

Restorative models are often difficult to classify due to the diverse range of models and hybrid versions evolving all the time. In light of the three main justice models presently available: circle sentencing, victim-offender reconciliation and family group counseling (Elliot, 2004), it is not the intent of this paper to discuss the specifics of these, but rather, to extract the essence that these models are based on, or the *Zeitgeist* of the times in response to which they have evolved. Having said this, two models will be briefly touched on that are presently used in a limited capacity in the British Columbia school system: preventive and responsive. For example, "Project Planet Peace" in Mission, British Columbia, is a preventive program that works on modeling values, education, and community building (Elliot, 2004). One can only imagine what a world it would be if leaders and constituents were prepared to marry Havel's (year) notion of "Planet Democracy" with "Project Planet Peace." Other, less forward looking school-based programs such as one in Sparwood, British Columbia, focus more on a responsive type of justice model for the purpose of a reaction-formation in response to a crisis situation (Elliot, 2004).

Given the variety of individual contexts, it is imperative that leaders do not approach restorative education from a pre-conceived point of view if they want to avoid the problems of the past in terms of isolating educational challenges from the challenges faced by the larger society. Learning communities are microcosms of the larger society. This implies developing models that will allow leaders to move beyond a textbook view of the world where special interest groups do battle as social gladiators, each trying to further assert their cause. Indeed, as Shklar (1986, p. 31) reminds us, it is in hierarchical societies that victims “flourish.” Keeping this in mind, what is needed is a non-hierarchical, holistic approach that embodies mind, body and the spirit of the times: the Zeitgeist of education in post-modern era that reflects the ethical and moral responsibility educational leaders have a duty to embrace (Boss, 1998).

So where does a leader begin, when considering the implementation of a restitutive justice model? The leader begins with herself – by doing an honest analysis of her own values, motivations, goals and relationships to the various levels of the organization. This complex task is simplified or made more doable by using Wilber’s model as organizing framework.

Interior Individual: <i>Intentional</i> -Leader’s self –awareness of values, morals, proclivities and weaknesses, world view, motivations, sense of where one stands in relation to others, and one’s goals in personal and organizational life -Leader’s perceptions of personal power and power relationships within the organization	Exterior Individual: <i>Behavioral</i> -Leader’s knowledge of physical, academic and psychological needs of students and staff -Leader’s knowledge of different learning styles, intelligences and motivations, and their relationships to curriculum and instruction -Leader’s knowledge of special needs of students, parents or teachers
Interior Collective: <i>cultural</i> -Awareness and understanding of “tribal reality tunnels” – among school staff, among students, among parents and school community, among special interest groups and subgroups of school culture, and reality tunnels of ethnic groups and home communities of students	Exterior Collective: <i>social systems</i> -Leader’s knowledge of legislation and policies, and their implications at the school, school system, and government levels -Leader’s knowledge of power relationships between various levels of the education system -Leader’s knowledge of planning and budgeting -Leader’s knowledge of leeway to act independently, offered by policies at all levels of the system

Once the leader has analyzed herself and her relationship to the organization, she can proceed to plot this diagram from the organization’s perspective.

Since human beings are defined by Wilber as “holons” – simultaneously operating as individuals and as parts of larger units, the quadrant framework applies equally well to the leader as an individual, as well as to the organization. She can use her framework as a basis for wider consultation, where all participants can verify, add, and question, the items in all quadrants from their specific perspective. The resultant framework is holistic and integral – containing all the issues, needs, and goals of all parties involved, and showing the relationships between them. At this stage, the school community can devise a plan of action and set priorities, in accordance with the principles of restorative justice. This would be the leader’s next step – mapping out the organizational life into the four quadrants, thereby highlighting relationships, power, as well as

gaps in the organization. The framework can then be extended to include the organization's relationship with the State – in this case with the provincial government.

Role of the State

When the State becomes involved in the business of morality, laws reflect the interests of the ruling political party and their allies, often at the expense of the electorate. Thus, educational leaders need to be cognizant of the fact that the State often brings about legislation that is in the best interests of select groups and individuals in society (Harper, 1997), while marginalizing other groups. This political practice is well entrenched, despite the fact that educational leaders and their constituents are led to believe it is value neutral, and therefore, in both their best interests. Given this, leaders must remain vigilant in holding politicians accountable for the decisions they make. This vigilance is imperative, assuming that the broader political structure ultimately controls and defines the relationship the State has with institutions in society, including educational reform. Therefore, even though educational leaders run the risk of simply becoming battered puppets of the State in their attempt to hold the state accountable, Hodgkinson (1991), argues that leaders have an ethical responsibility and a moral duty to resist state backed reform trends that may not be in the best interest of their schools. At first glance, these last statements may come across as burdening educational leaders with a staggering responsibility. But it is a responsibility and a duty (Boss, 1998) that leaders agree to in their pursuit of a higher body of knowledge as educational leaders, and, ultimately, as agents of social change. Thus, to shirk this responsibility is akin to denying the moral responsibility of leadership and the struggles leaders must be prepared to take on that are utilitarian in nature.

Role of the Individual

From this perspective, institutionalized conflict arising out of tension between leaders and constituents can be a positive instrument in bringing about educational reform and change if leaders have the skills to guide the process to its desired conclusion. It is these ongoing tensions both inside and outside the walls of academe that make change possible. Thus, as agents of social change, while using a restorative education model that falls outside the traditional organizational matrix, leaders should both anticipate and embrace resistance. It is through these institutional struggles that leaders have the opportunity to exercise their moral outrage (Boss, 1998) through non-violent means such as those purported by Gandhi to bring about the change they would like to see in the world. Part of the success of any transformational model rests with the struggle behind the scenes to bring the model to fruition; it is through this type of institutional struggle that successful change is possible.

This struggle ultimately brings new opportunities for both individual and institutional growth, with society being the final recipient of what a New World order might look like. These organizational battles are never easy ones, and what is at stake is often a re-definition of the boundaries of the educational setting and a challenge to the political and power structure of the larger society. Such fundamental changes bring fear and insecurity, which can foster irrational acts aimed at safeguarding existing policies and practices that embody the status quo of the organization. None of the above, however, should prevent educational leaders from fully

exploring a restorative education model that may actually have a domino effect and make the world a more peaceable kingdom.

Summary and Conclusions

In closing, this paper has been an exploratory journey aimed at challenging traditional models of leadership with an eye towards bringing about change in the educational setting, and concomitantly, the larger society, through the use of a restorative educational model. This model reflects a restorative justice philosophy, premised on the belief that it is possible to elevate the education system to higher ordered thinking, while leaving behind the flaws of traditional organizational models. The notion of restorative education demands a model that embraces humanitarian tenets such as: respect, inclusivity, and fairness, which has its sights aimed at developing a global awareness of the issues society faces, and ways for both leaders and constituents to overcome the social barriers they face on a daily basis. It is imperative that as educational leaders we leave our comfort zones and move closer to the edge where all learning takes place. This journey brought to light that, in the final analysis, what this restorative educational model looks like may simply be a reflection of the educational Other (Bauman, 1993), that there is not one model that is going to work in all settings, but all models must reflect the genesis of their setting, and the unique needs of both educational leaders and constituents, with the ultimate goal being Planet Peace Democracy. Such models may run counter to the prevailing political practices, and therefore require considerable courage and willingness of leaders to take risks in very public arenas. This may be the biggest obstacle to the adoption of restorative justice models.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.A., & M. Adams. (1992). Acknowledging the learning styles of diverse student populations: implications for instructional design. In L.L.B. Border & N.V.N. Chism (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity* (pp. 19-93). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bauman, Z. (1993). *Post-modern ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bohac Clarke, V. (2002). In search of school spirit: The cloud of unknowing in public education. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*, 6(10). On-line <http://www.ucalgary.ca/~iejll>
- Bohm, R. M. (1997). *A primer on crime and delinquency*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Boss, J.A. (1998). *Ethics for life: An interdisciplinary and multicultural introduction* (2nd ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). Transactional and transformational leadership. In J.T. Wren (Ed.), *The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages* (pp. 100-101). New York: Free Press.
- Capp, W.H. (1968). *Interpreting Vaclav Havel*. CrossCurrents.<http://www.crosscurrents.org/capps.html>

Cawsey, R.A. (1991). *Task Force on the Criminal Justice System and its impact on the Indian and Metis people of Alberta*. Edmonton, AB, Canada: Attorney General and Solicitor General of Alberta.

Clear, T.R., & H.R. Dammer. (2003). *The offender in the community*. Toronto, ON, Canada: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.

Covey, S. (2004). *The eighth habit: From effectiveness to greatness*. Toronto, ON, Canada: Free Press.

Elliot, L. (2004). From scales to circles: Restorative justice as peacemaking and social justice. In J.V. Roberts & M.G. Grossman (Eds.), *Criminal justice in Canada* (pp. 289-303). Scarborough, ON, Canada: Thomson Nelson.

Firestone, W.A. (1989). Education policy as an ecology of games. *Educational Researcher*, 18(7), 18-23.

Harper, H. (1997). Difference and diversity in Ontario schooling. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 22 (2), 192-206.

Havel, V. (n.d.). The need for transcendence in the post modern world.
<http://www.Worldtrans.org/whole/havelspeech.html>

Havel, V. (1992). *Summer meditations*. New York: Knopf.

Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational leadership: The moral art*. New York: State University of New York.

Hodgkinson, C. (1999). Introduction and the will to power. In P. Begley (Ed.), *Values and educational leadership* (Chapter 7).. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Johnson, S.G. (1997). *The gender knot: Unraveling our patriarchal legacy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lupart, J. L. (1998). Setting right the delusion of inclusion: Implications for Canadian schools. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 23(3), 251-264.

Maher, F., & M.K.T. Tetrault. (1992). Inside feminist classrooms: An ethnographic approach. In L.L.B. Border & N.V.N. Chism (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity* (pp. 57-74). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mason, M. (2001). Ethics of integrity: Educational values beyond postmodern ethics. *Journal of Philosophy*, 35(1), pp. 47-69.

Shklar, J. N. (1986). Injustice, injury and inequality: An introduction. In F.S. Lucash (Ed.),

Justice and equality here and now (pp. 13-34). New York: Cornell.

Taylor, C. (1985). *Philosophy and the human sciences. Philosophical paper 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilber, K. (2000). *A theory of everything: An integral vision for business, politics, science and spirituality*. Boston: Shambala.

Author's Addresses:

Joan M. Nesbitt
Criminology Faculty
Kwantlen University College
8771 Landsdowne Road
Richmond, BC, Canada
Email: joan.nesbitt@kwantlen.bc.ca

Veronika Bohac Clarke
Graduate Division of Educational Research
Faculty of Education
University of Calgary
2500 University Drive NW
Calgary, AB, Canada
T2N 1N4
Email: bohac@ucalgary.ca